



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,792	01/15/2004	Brian J. Cragun	ROC920030266US1	5430

7590 03/31/2006

William J. McGinnis, Jr.
IBM Corporation, Dept. 917
3605 Highway 52 North
Rochester, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER

DEBROW, JAMES J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/757,792	CRAGUN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James J. Debrow	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/15/2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed on 15 Jan 2004.
2. Claims 1-20 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 8, 13, and 17 are independent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fairchild et al. (Patent No.: 6,728,760 B1; Filing Date: May. 5, 1999) in view of Sidana (Patent No.: 6,571,295 B1; Filing Date: Jul. 19, 1999).**

In regard to independent claim 1, Fairchild et al. discloses a *method for managing annotations comprising:*

detecting one or more changes to a document having at least one annotation corresponding to at least one portion of the document prior to occurrence of the one or more changes (column 8, line 65-67 & column 9, lines 1-2; Fairchild et al. discloses automatic tracking of new versions of a document.);

if so, updating an annotation record based on the one or more changes to the document (column 5, line 1-5; Fairchild et al. discloses updating annotation records according to changes in media items. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply this teaching to documents.).

Art Unit: 2176

Fairchild et al. does not disclose expressly, *determining if the at least one annotation should be applied to the document, as changed*;

However, Sidana discloses *determining if the at least one annotation should be applied to the document, as changed* (column 2, lines 17-23; Sidana discloses the redirector (software program) detects document has been changes, modifies the document with the changes, and the user determines whether or not to add any previously added annotation to the document).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sidana with Fairchild et al. for the benefit of modifying documents to include added annotation (column 2, 21-22).

In regard to dependent claim 2, Fairchild et al. does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 1, wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating an index indicating an annotated portion of the document*.

However, Sidana discloses *the method of claim 1, wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating an index indicating an annotated portion of the document* (column 2, lines 31-33; Sidana discloses once the document is displayed in the browser, the user can modify (*update*) the annotations or other information associated with the document. The examiner uses the broadest interpretation "other

information associated with the document” to include indexes indicating an annotated portion of the document).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sidana with Fairchild et al. for the benefit of updating an index indicating an annotated portion of the document.

In regard to dependent claim 3, Fairchild et al. does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 1, wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating one or more indexes to refer to multiple versions of the document.*

However, Sidana discloses *the method of claim 1, wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating one or more indexes to refer to multiple versions of the document* (column 2, lines 31-33; Sidana discloses once the document is displayed in the browser, the user can modify (*update*) the annotations or other information associated with the document. The examiner uses the broadest interpretation “other information associated with the document” to include indexes indicating an annotated portion of the document. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the indexing to refer to multiple versions of a document).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sidana with Fairchild et al. for the benefit of updating to multiple versions of the document.

In regard to dependent claim 4, Fairchild et al. discloses *the method of claim 1, wherein updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document comprises:*

copying an existing annotation record referring to the document prior to the one or more changes (column 7, lines 33-35; Fairchild teaches annotations can be copied from one media base to another. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply this teaching transferring the annotations of one document to an updated version of that document); *and*

updating the annotation record copied to reflect the one or more changes to the document (column 5, lines 1-5).

In regard to dependent claim 5, Fairchild et al. does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 1, wherein detecting one or more changes to the document comprises comparing change detection values generated for the at least one annotated portion of the document prior to and after the one or more changes.*

However, Sidana discloses *the method of claim 1, wherein detecting one or more changes to the document comprises comparing change detection values generated for the at least one annotated portion of the document prior to and after the one or more changes* (column 10, lines 36-45; Sidana discloses a expired flag (*detection value*), which indicated a change has occurred in the document).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fairchild with Sidana for the benefit of detecting one or more changes to the document.

In regard to dependent claim 6, Fairchild et al. discloses *the method of claim 5, wherein the change detection values are hash values generated for the at least one annotated portion of the document prior to and after the one or more changes.* (column 8, lines 35-40; Fairchild et al. discloses original media item (document) maintains as part of its annotation record, a list of locations (*hash values*) of copies of the media item (*document*). Using this list (hash table), it is possible to find that a cached copy of the media item (*document*) resides in a receiving cache on a server. As with the current invention, Fairchild et al. teaches the concept of a hash table. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that hash tables would contain hash values.).

In regard to dependent claim 7, Fairchild et al. discloses *the method of claim 1, further comprising, prior to updating the annotation record:*

notifying a user the document has changed (column 1, lines 41-43; column 2, lines 47-52); *and*

receiving validation from the user that the annotation should be applied to the

Art Unit: 2176

document as changed (column 9, lines 9-13; Fig. 7; Fairchild et al. discloses an user interface Edit Annotation form. Clicking the "Edit Annotation" button validates the user acceptance of updating and annotation record.).

In regard to independent claim 8, Fairchild et al. discloses a *method comprising:*

receiving a document to be checked into a content management system, the document having at least one annotation corresponding to an annotated portion thereof, wherein one or more changes to the document have been made subsequent to creation of the annotation (column 8, line 65-67 & column 9, lines 1-2; Fairchild et al. discloses automatic tracking of new versions of a document.);

updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation based on the one or more changes to the document (column 5, line 1-5; Fairchild et al. discloses updating annotation records according to changes in media items. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply this teaching to one or more changes in documents.).

Fairchild et al. does not disclose expressly, *determining if the at least one annotation should be applied to the document, as changed;*

However, Sidana discloses *determining if the at least one annotation should be applied to the document, as changed* (column 2, lines 17-23; Sidana discloses the redirector (software program) detects document has been changes, modifies the

document with the changes, and the user determines whether or not to add any previously added annotation to the document).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sidana with Fairchild et al. for the benefit of modifying documents to include added annotation (column 2, 21-22).

In regard to dependent claim 9, Fairchild et al. discloses *the method of claim 8, wherein determining if the annotation should be applied to the document as changed comprises determining whether a creator of the annotation specified the annotation should be applied to subsequent versions of the document* (column 1, lines 38-41).

In regard to dependent claim 10, Fairchild et al. discloses *the method of claim 9, further comprising:*

determining if the user specified that validation should occur prior to updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document (column 9, lines 9-13; Fig. 7; Fairchild et al. discloses an user interface Edit Annotation form. Clicking the "Edit Annotation" button validates the user acceptance of updating and annotation record.);

if so, prompting a user for such validation (column 9, lines 9-13; Fig. 7; Fairchild et al. discloses an user interface Edit Annotation form. Clicking the "Edit Annotation" button, validates the user acceptance of updating and annotation record.); *and*

updating the annotation record only after receiving such validation (column 5, line 1-5).

In regard to dependent claim 11, Fairchild et al. discloses *the method of claim 8, wherein updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document comprises:*

running an algorithm to identify the annotated portion of the document corresponding to the at least one annotation in the document as changed (column 8, line 65-67 & column 9, lines 1-2; Fairchild et al. discloses automatic tracking of new versions of a document. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that an algorithm is no more than computer software to perform the task as claimed.); and

if the annotated portion is identified by the algorithm, updating the annotation record based on results of running the algorithm (column 5, line 1-5; At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that an algorithm is no more than computer software to perform the task as claimed.).

In regard to dependent claim 12, Fairchild et al. discloses *the method of claim 11, further comprising, if the annotated portion is not identified by the algorithm:*

prompting a user to identify the annotation portion in the document, as changed (column 9, line 25-28); and

updating the annotation record based on input received from the user (column 9, line 28-31).

In regard to independent claim 13, Fairchild et al. discloses *detecting one or more changes to a document having at least one annotation corresponding to at least one portion of the document prior to the one or more change* (column 8, line 65-67 & column 9, lines 1-2; Fairchild et al. discloses automatic tracking of new versions of a document.);

updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to based on the one or more changes to the document (column 5, line 1-5; Fairchild et al. discloses updating annotation records according to changes in media items. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply this teaching to documents.).

Fairchild et al. does not disclose expressly *a computer-readable medium containing a program which, when executed by a processor, performs operations comprising:*

determining if an annotation corresponding to at least one annotated portion of the document prior to the change should be applied to the document, as changed;

However, Sidana discloses *a computer-readable medium containing a program which, when executed by a processor, performs operations comprising* (column 14, lines 1-2):

determining if an annotation corresponding to at least one annotated portion of the document prior to the change should be applied to the document, as changed (column 2, lines 17-23; Sidana discloses the redirector (software program) detects document has been changes, modifies the document with the changes, and the user determines whether or not to add any previously added annotation to the document).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sidana with Fairchild et al. for the benefit of modifying documents to include added annotation (column 2, 21-22).

In regard to dependent claim 14, Fairchild et al. does not disclose expressly *the computer-readable medium of claim 13, wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating an index indicating an annotated portion of the document.*

However, Sidana discloses *the computer-readable medium of claim 13* (column 14, lines 1-2), *wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating an index indicating an annotated portion of the document.*

(column 2, lines 31-33; Sidana discloses once the document is displayed in the browser, the user can modify (*update*) the annotations or other information associated with the document. The examiner uses the broadest interpretation "other information

Art Unit: 2176

associated with the document" to include indexes indicating an annotated portion of the document).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sidana with Fairchild et al. for the benefit of updating an index indicating an annotated portion of the document.

In regard to dependent claim 15, Fairchild et al. does not disclose expressly *the computer-readable medium of claim 13, wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating generating a change detection value for the document, or a portion of the document, to reflect the one or more changes.*

However, Sidana discloses *the computer-readable medium of claim 13* (column 14, lines 1-2), *wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating generating a change detection value for the document, or a portion of the document, to reflect the one or more changes* (column 10, lines 36-45; Sidana discloses a expired flag (*detection value*), which indicated a change has occurred in the document).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fairchild with Sidana for the benefit of detecting one or more changes to the document.

In regard to dependent claim 16, Fairchild et al. discloses *updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document comprising:*

copying an existing annotation record referring to the document prior to the one or more changes (column 7, lines 33-35; Fairchild teaches annotations can be copied from one media base to another. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply this teaching transferring the annotations of one document to an updated version of that document); *and*

updating the annotation record copied to reflect the one or more changes to the document (column 5, lines 1-5).

Fairchild et al. does not disclose expressly *the computer-readable medium of claim 13*.

However, Sidana discloses *the computer-readable medium of claim 13* (column 14, lines 1-2).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sidana with Fairchild et al. for the benefit a computer-readable medium embodied with instructions, when executed by a computer system would enable to computer system to update an annotation record associated with a document.

In regard to independent claim 17, Fairchild et al. *discloses a system comprising:*

at least one application (column 2, lines 15-20);
an annotation maintenance component configured to detect changes to a document managed by the content management system, the document having at least one annotation corresponding to an annotated portion thereof, wherein one or more changes to the document have been made subsequent to creation of the annotation (column 8, line 65-67 & column 9, lines 1-2; Fairchild et al. discloses automatic tracking of new versions of a document.), and if so,

update an annotation record containing the at least one annotation based on the one or more changes to the document (column 5, line 1-5; Fairchild et al. discloses updating annotation records according to changes in media items (documents). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply this teaching to documents.).

Fairchild et al. does not disclose expressly *a content management system for managing a plurality of documents manipulated by the at least one application;*
an annotation database for holding annotation records, each containing annotation data related to one or more of the plurality of documents; and
determine if the annotation should be applied to the document as changed.

However, Sidana discloses *a content management system for managing a plurality of documents manipulated by the at least one application* (column 2, lines 13-30; Sidana discloses the process of managing the documents from the document server to the user browser);

an annotation database for holding annotation records, each containing annotation data related to one or more of the plurality of documents (column 4, lines 63-65); *and*

determine if the annotation should be applied to the document as changed (column 2, lines 17-23; Sidana discloses the redirector (software program) detects document has been changes, modifies the document with the changes, and the user determines whether or not to add any previously added annotation to the document).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sidana with Fairchild et al. for the benefit of modifying documents to include added annotation (column 2, 21-22).

In regard to dependent claim 18, Fairchild et al. discloses *the system of claim 17, wherein the annotation maintenance component is configured to update an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document by updating an annotation index stored in the annotation record* (column 5, lines 1-5).

In regard to dependent claim 19, Fairchild et al. discloses *the system of claim 17, wherein the annotation maintenance component is configured to update an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document by updating a change detection value stored in the annotation record* (column 5, lines 1-5; column 8, lines 35-40).

In regard to dependent claim 20, Fairchild et al. discloses *the system of claim 17, wherein the annotation maintenance component is integrated with the content management system* (column 5, lines 1-5; Fairchild et al. discloses updating and deleting media/document items (*content management*), and updating annotation records (*annotation maintenance*)).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James J. Debrow whose telephone number is 571-272-5768. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JAMES DEBROW
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2176



DOUG HUTTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100